Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

1976 Report of

RANDOM SAMPLE EGG PRODUCTION TESTS

United States and Canada

Two-Year Combined Summary, 1974-75 and 1975-76

Range Group Rankings, 1975-76

ARS-NE-21-4

February 1977

ANIMAL IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAMS
LABORATORY

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE • U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PREFACE

Egg production tests are designed to provide poultrymen, hatcherymen, and breeders with a reliable guide to the performance of poultry stocks offered for sale. This publication contains information on many egg production traits that are of economic importance to the trade. The data were compiled from the records of official Random Sample Egg Production Tests conducted in the United States and Canada. The data resulting from these tests have been analyzed statistically by the Animal Improvement Programs Laboratory, Animal Physiology and Genetics Institute, Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Beltsville, Maryland.

The publication of this report is based on recommendations of the National Committee on Random Sample Poultry Testing and the Council of American Official Poultry Tests. The information was compiled by the Poultry Improvement Staff, Animal Improvement Programs Laboratory, Agricultural Research Service, from data furnished by Test supervisors.

The publication of this report does not imply approval or endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture of any of the stocks mentioned.

CONTENTS

TABLES

This report is divided into four sections:

1. A two-year combined summary of the data obtained in the 1974-75 and 1975-76 Random Sample Egg Production Tests. These data were treated by acceptable statistical procedures that allow the reader to compare directly the stock entered in the various egg production tests in the United States and Canada.

2. An explanation of statistical procedures that were used in computing the regressed means and confidence limits of egg production traits evaluated in the two-year combined summary.

3. A range group ranking for stock that was entered in 1975-76 Random Sample Egg Production Tests. The ranking shows the performance of each stock by traits compared with that of other stocks in the same test.

4. List of stocks entered in 1975-76 tests and some of the management conditions at the test during the 1975-76 test year.

TWO-YEAR COMBINED SUMMARY FOR TEST YEARS 1974-75 AND 1975-76

Entries in the various tests start with a random sample of hatching eggs or chicks of the stock to be tested. Samples are drawn according to prescribed methods to ensure that each entry is typical of the stock it represents. All entries within a test are treated alike with respect to housing, feeding, management, and disease control in order to avoid differences in performance that would be due to environment.

All tests are conducted according to these basic principles. However, even the most carefully designed and conducted tests are influenced by errors of two kinds. The first kind of error is the chance deviation or unavoidable "sampling error" made when a small sample of eggs or chicks represents an entry. The other kind of error is due to uncontrolled or unknown environmental differences between entries that occur in spite of all efforts to treat all entries within a given test as nearly alike as possible. The differences between the results for two entries in a single test for a single year may be due to these chance variations rather than to a real difference in the performance capabilities of the two stocks. The effect of such errors in comparing stocks can be materially reduced by basing comparisons on the combined results of several tests over two or more years.

If all entries compared were entered in the same tests in both years, the simple averages could be compared directly without adjustment. However, differences among tests and between years and those caused by climatic conditions and other environmental factors affect the results. As a consequence, a direct comparison of the test results of two stocks in different tests or in different years may be misleading. Therefore, to present test results in a manner that will allow sound evaluation of all stocks tested, the results were combined by stocks and by years, and were adjusted by accepted statistical procedures for test and year differences and for variation in amount of information per stock. The results of these computations are published as the "regressed mean" for each trait for each stock that was tested (table 1).

The performance data (regressed means) reported in this summary are derived from the results reported by the individual tests for each of the past two years. It is unlikely, however, that the means for any stock, even though entered in only one test each year, will coincide precisely with the two-year average performance data as published by the test. The variations are due to adjustments for test differences, year difference, the number of tests and of years entered, and the number of replicates per test. These statistical adjustments allow predictions of what the average performance would have been for each stock had all stocks been entered in all tests each year.

The statistical treatment applied to the test data is designed to reduce the influence of nongenetic variations. This cannot be accomplished perfectly, and consequently, estimates or predictions of performance cannot be made with absolute precision. However, reliable predictions, within prescribed limitations, can be made as to whether a difference in the reported performance of stocks represents a real difference in their performance. These predictions involve the use of the confidence limit values that have been computed for each trait or performance factor reported.

A brief explanation of the statistical procedures used in computing the regressed means and confidence limits is provided in the section entitled "Procedures Used for Computing Combined Summary Values."

The following example illustrates the compilation of the two-year combined summary. This and the related explanation will help the reader to use and interpret the data in table 1.

(Illustration of regressed means and 80 percent confidence limits
as they might appear for a few traits)

| STOCK CODE | FEED PER POUND OF EGGS PRODUCED (pounds) | | EGG WEIGHT (oz./doz.) | | LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (percent) | | ALBUMEN QUALITY (Haugh units) | | BLOOD SPOTS | | | | BODY WEIGHT (pounds) | |
| | | | | | | | | | 1/8 INCH OR MORE (percent) | | LESS THAN 1/8 INCH (percent) | | | |
	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSEO MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSEO MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSEO MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSEO MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS
995	3.02	2.95 3.09	26.0	25.7 26.3	77.5	75.2 79.8	77.9	77.1 78.7	1.1	0.9 1.4	2.7	2.2 3.2	5.6	5.4 5.8
996	2.83	2.77 2.89	25.2	25.0 25.4	71.0	69.0 72.8	80.9	80.1 81.7	0.7	0.6 1.0	1.1	0.8 1.4	4.2	4.0 4.4
997	2.94	2.86 3.02	24.9	24.6 25.2	68.0	65.5 70.3	74.1	73.3 74.9	1.2	1.0 1.4	1.9	1.5 2.4	4.7	4.5 4.9
998	2.84	2.73 2.95	25.3	24.9 25.7	72.4	69.2 75.6	76.6	75.5 77.7	1.0	0.9 1.2	1.5	1.2 1.9	4.0	3.7 4.3
999	2.56	2.47 2.65	25.4	25.0 25.8	70.3	67.6 73.0	83.0	82.3 88.7	0.8	0.6 1.0	1.1	0.7 1.4	4.2	3.9 4.5

*If the confidence limits for two regressed means overlap, the two means are not significantly different at the 5% level.

The range of the confidence limits represents the amount of difference in the performance of two stocks that may be due to chance. If the confidence limits for two regressed means overlap, the two means are not significantly different at the 5 percent level of probability. If the confidence limits for two regressed means do not overlap, the odds are at least 19 in 20 that a real difference exists in the performance of the two stocks.

The use of the above data as a means of evaluating different stocks and traits can be illustrated as follows:

For the trait "Body Weight," the confidence limits of Stock 995 (5.4 to 5.8 lbs.) do not overlap the confidence limits of any of the other stocks. Therefore, Stock 995 has a significantly higher body weight than the others. However, the confidence limits of Stock 996 (4.0 to 4.4 lbs.) overlap the confidence limits of Stock 998 (3.7 to 4.3 lbs.) and Stock 999 (3.9 to 4.5 lbs.). The body weights of these three stocks are, therefore, not significantly different.

Using the trait "Feed per Pound of Eggs Produced" as another example, the confidence limits of Stock 995 (2.95 to 3.09 lbs.), Stock 997 (2.86 to 3.02 lbs.), and Stock 998 (2.73 to 2.95 lbs.) all overlap each other. Thus there is no significant difference in the feed conversion of these three stocks. When comparing the feed conversion of Stock 999 (2.56 lbs.) with that of the other stocks, we see that the range of its confidence limits is from 2.47 to 2.65 lbs. Since this range does not overlap the confidence limits of the other four stocks, Stock 999 has a significantly lower feed conversion than the other stocks listed.

Another example can be shown by using the trait "Albumen Quality." The confidence limits of Stock 995 (77.1 to 78.7) overlap the confidence limits of Stock 998 (75.5 to 77.7). Therefore, there is no significant difference in the albumen quality of these two stocks, even though the regressed mean of Stock 995 is 77.9 Haugh Units and Stock 998 is 76.6 Haugh Units. When Stock 995 is compared with Stocks 996 and 999, we see that the confidence limits of these two stocks do not overlap those of Stock 995. Thus, these two stocks have a significantly higher albumen quality (80.9 and 83.0 Haugh Units, respectively) than the 77.9 Haugh Units of Stock 995. In comparing Stock 995 with Stock 997, the confidence limits do not overlap. In this case, the albumen quality of Stock 997, expressed as a regressed mean of 74.1 Haugh Units is significantly lower than the regressed mean of Stock 995.

The range of the confidence limits will not necessarily be the same for two different stocks that have the same regressed mean. The number of locations in which a stock is entered, the number of replicate pens per location, the number of years entered, and the accuracy involved in adjusting for location and year effects all have a bearing on the range of the confidence limits for each individual regressed mean.

The "Income Over Feed and Chick Cost" figures reported in table 1 represent the sales value of the eggs produced and of the hens at the end of the test minus the cost of the chicks and the feed used during the growing and laying periods. These figures may be useful in comparing the overall performance of stocks, but they should not be considered as predictions of "profit" to be obtained under commercial operations. The "income" figures should be reduced by other costs, such as labor, building and equipment depreciation, vaccination, litter, interest, taxes, and insurance, to approximate profits that might be expected under commercial conditions. Surveys conducted among commercial producers indicate that such other costs may range from $1 to $2 per pullet housed.

Although the average chick price is reported for each stock, this value cannot be appropriately used to convert the "Income Over Feed and Chick Cost" figure to an income over feed cost figure. The average chick price shown is a simple unadjusted average of the prices reported by the entrant for his entries in the various tests and is not directly comparable to chick cost included in "Income Over Feed and Chick Cost."

Stocks Should be Compared for all Traits

All traits should be considered when using this report to evaluate the overall performance of the various stocks. The values reported for "Income Over Feed and Chick Cost" represent a composite of several traits combined as determined by the economic conditions of the areas in which the tests are located. The conditions under which the stock is expected to perform in commercial production may differ from those prevailing at the tests, and such differences should be taken into consideration. For example, a poultryman whose local market pays unusually high premiums for large and extra large eggs should place more emphasis on egg size in his evaluation of stock than poultrymen located in areas where such premiums are not available. The local market preference for brown or white shells should also be taken into account. Traits related to interior egg quality that affect the grade are of greatest importance in areas where prices are based on quality standards.

Each person should study his local needs and conditions and then place appropriate emphasis on the performance traits that are of greatest importance to his situation. A productive and profitable stock for one poultryman under one set of conditions may not fit the needs of another poultryman under a different set of conditions.

Definition of Terms Used and Abbreviations

Stock: A term used to identify a specific breeding combination of chickens. These breeding combinations may include pure strains, strain crosses, breed crosses, incrosses, or combinations thereof. Kinds of stock and breeding methods are---

BPR	Barred Plymouth Rock	Syn.	Synthetic	IN	Incross
NH	New Hampshire	WL	White Leghorn	INX	Incrossbred
RIR	Rhode Island Red	WPR	White Plymouth Rock	PS	Pure Strain
RIW	Rhode Island White	BX	Crossbred	SX	Strain Cross

Tests: Canada Central (C. C.)   New Hampshire Floor (N.H.-F.)
Florida (Fla.)   North Carolina (N.C.)
Missouri Cage (Mo.-C.)   Pennsylvania (Pa.)
Missouri Floor (Mo.-F.)   Tennessee (Tenn.)
New Hampshire Cage (N.H.-C.)

Test Year: A period beginning during the first year stated in a double-year designation and ending approximately 500 days later. See management summary shown in table 7.

Definition of Traits

Growing mortality	Percentage of birds that died on or before the time they were 150 days old or subsequent age at housing.
Laying mortality	Percentage of birds that died after they were 150 days old or subsequent age at housing.
Age at 50 percent production	Days of age computed from the first day of the first two consecutive days of 50 percent production for living birds in the entry at that time.
Hen-housed egg production	Number of eggs laid per pullet housed computed from time of housing to the end of the test.
Hen-day egg production (to end of test)	Percent hen-day production from the time birds reached 50 percent production to end of test.
Hen-day egg production (last 30 to 60 days)	Percent hen-day production during the last 30 to 60 days of the test. Length of time involved varies according to the record keeping system of each individual test.
Feed per pound of eggs	Pounds of feed per pound of eggs produced, computed from bulk weighing of the eggs at least one day every two weeks or two days a month at equal intervals during the laying period of the test.
Feed per 100 birds per day	Average pounds of feed consumed per day per 100 birds, calculated over the entire test period.
Egg weight	The weight of a dozen eggs computed from bulk weighing of the eggs at least one day every two weeks or two days a month during the laying period of the test.
Large and extra large eggs	Percentage of large and extra large eggs as determined by egg-size distribution computed from all eggs laid one day each week.
Albumen quality	Haugh units, computed from egg weight and albumen height of broken-out egg measured on one day's eggs per quarter, at equal intervals. The greater the Haugh units the higher the albumen quality.
Large blood spots	Percentage of eggs with one or more large blood spots (1/8 inch or more in diameter), computed from at least three days' eggs per quarter, broken-out basis.
Small blood spots	Percentage of eggs with one or more small blood spots (less than 1/8 inch in diameter), computed from at least three days' eggs per quarter, broken-out basis.
Large meat spots	Percentage of eggs with one or more colored large meat spots (1/8 inch or more in diameter), computed from at least three days' eggs per quarter, broken-out basis.
Small meat spots	Percentage of eggs with one or more colored small meat spots (less than 1/8 inch in diameter), computed from at least three days' egg per quarter, broken-out basis.
Specific gravity score	Eggs are given the specific gravity score that corresponds with the specific gravity of the solution in which they will float. Eggs that do not float in 1.100 solution are given a nine score. The specific gravity of an egg is closely correlated with shell thickness; therefore, the higher the specific gravity score, the thicker the shell. Tabulation of specific gravity solutions and the corresponding specific gravity scores follow:

Solution	Score		Solution	Score
1.068	--- 0		1.088	--- 5
1.072	--- 1		1.092	--- 6
1.076	--- 2		1.096	--- 7
1.080	--- 3		1.100	--- 8
1.084	--- 4			

Body weight	Average weight of birds alive at end of test.
Income over feed and chick cost	Income over feed and chick cost per pullet housed, with chick cost in 1,000 lots at hatch date adjusted for mortality (accidental deaths, sexing errors, and missing chicks not included).

4

Canada Central Egg Production Test
       W. K. Barr, Poultry Production Section, Canada Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
              Phone 613/994-9571

Florida Poultry Evaluation Center
       R. B. Christmas, Chipley, Fla. 32428
              Phone 904/638-0588

New Hampshire Egg Production Test (Cage)
       W. C. Skoglund, Department of Poultry Science, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H. 03824
              Phone 603/862-2130

New Hampshire Egg Production Test (Floor)
       W. C. Skoglund, Department of Poultry Science, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H. 03824
              Phone 603/862-2130

North Carolina Random Sample Egg Laying Test, Salisbury
       G. A. Martin, Poultry Extension Department, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N. C. 27607
              Phone 919/755-2621

Pennsylvania Random Sample Laying Test
       Edgar V. Hammers, Pennsylvania Furnace, Pa. 16865
              Phone 814/692-8446

Tennessee Random Sample Laying Test
       H. V. Shirley, Jr., Animal Science Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. 37916
              Phone 615/974-7374

Copies of the final report for any of the Random Sample Egg Production Tests listed above can be obtained
by writing to the test supervisor.

Table 1.—Two-year combined summary: Regressed means and 80% confidence limits for traits by stocks entered

STOCK CODE	BREEDER'S NAME AND ADDRESS	BREEDING	STRAIN OR TRADENAME	MORTALITY GROWING (percent)		MORTALITY LAYING (percent)		AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION (days)		HEN HOUSED (number)		HEN-DAY (TO END OF TEST) (percent)		HEN-DAY (LAST 30-60 DAYS) (percent)		FEED PER DAY PER 100 LAYING HENS (pounds)	
				RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS
570	Animal Research Institute Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	WL	PS Kentville R.B.C.-----	3.6	2.7 4.6	5.8	4.1 7.7	168	164 172	212	203 221	64.2	62.2 66.2	51.7	49.0 54.4	23.7	22.9 24.5
457	Anthony, George M. & Sons Strausstown, PA 19559	WL	SX Anthony-76----------	4.7	3.7 5.8	8.6	6.6 10.8	163	159 167	240	231 249	73.2	71.3 75.1	62.6	60.2 65.0	23.6	22.8 24.4
307	Babcock Poultry Farm, Inc. Ithaca, NY 14850	WL	IN Babcock B-300--------	3.3	2.6 4.2	6.7	5.4 8.0	162	159 165	242	236 248	73.3	72.1 74.5	63.2	61.7 64.7	24.7	24.2 25.2
442	Babcock Poultry Farm, Inc. Ithaca, NY 14850	RIRxSYN	BX Babcock B-380-------	1.7	1.1 2.4	3.1	2.2 4.2	171	168 174	234	228 240	71.1	69.7 72.5	59.8	58.0 61.6	26.2	25.6 26.8
459	Barr's Egg Farm Knoxville, TN 37921	BPR	PS Barr's Barred Rock--	4.6	3.7 5.7	13.8	11.2 16.7	173	169 177	186	176 196	63.1	61.0 65.2	54.3	51.6 57.0	****	**** ****
982	Canada Dept. of Agriculture Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	WL	SYN P.D. 58-----------	3.3	2.5 4.2	5.8	4.2 7.7	163	159 167	246	237 255	73.9	71.8 76.0	63.0	60.4 65.6	23.5	22.8 24.2
437	Carey Farms Marion, OH 43302	WL	IN Carey Nick 310------	3.7	2.8 4.6	5.9	4.5 7.4	170	166 174	245	238 252	74.8	73.3 76.3	67.5	65.6 69.4	25.0	24.4 25.6
289	Colonial Poultry Farm, Inc. Pleasant Hill, MO 64080	WL	IN True-Line 365 B-----	3.0	2.3 3.8	5.8	4.1 7.7	163	159 167	226	217 235	68.6	66.5 70.7	56.1	53.4 58.8	23.2	22.4 24.0
432	Colonial Poultry Farm, Inc. Pleasant Hill, MO 64080	WL	IN True-Line 365 S-----	3.1	2.4 4.0	7.6	6.3 9.2	165	162 168	222	216 228	68.3	67.0 69.6	56.7	55.1 58.3	22.4	21.9 22.9
309	Davis, Joe K., Hatchery Earl, NC 28038	RIRxBPR	BX Davis Combiner------	3.0	2.2 3.9	7.4	5.8 9.2	173	169 177	216	209 223	66.6	65.0 68.2	55.7	53.6 57.8	25.9	25.2 26.6
110	DeKalb AgResearch, Inc. DeKalb, IL 60115	WL	SX DeKalb-Kimber K-137-	2.1	1.4 2.8	8.9	6.9 11.2	166	162 170	224	216 232	70.4	68.6 72.2	59.8	57.3 62.3	24.3	23.6 25.0
454	DeKalb AgResearch, Inc. DeKalb, IL 60115	--	INX DeKalb 231-----------	2.0	1.4 2.8	7.6	5.7 9.7	164	160 168	240	232 248	73.2	71.3 75.1	62.8	60.3 65.3	24.5	23.8 25.2
456	DeKalb-Warren, Inc. North Brookfield, MA 15350	SYNxRIR	BX DeKalb Amber Link---	3.1	2.3 4.0	3.3	2.1 4.7	174	170 178	242	234 250	73.7	71.9 75.5	64.2	61.8 66.6	25.3	24.6 26.0

STOCK CODE	FEED PER POUND OF EGGS PRODUCED (pounds)		EGG WEIGHT (oz./doz.)		LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (percent)		ALBUMEN QUALITY (Haugh units)		BLOOD SPOTS 1/8 INCH OR MORE (percent)		BLOOD SPOTS LESS THAN 1/8 INCH (percent)		MEAT SPOTS 1/8 INCH OR MORE (percent)		MEAT SPOTS LESS THAN 1/8 INCH (percent)		SPECIFIC GRAVITY SCORE		BODY WEIGHT (pounds)		INCOME OVER FEED & CHICK COST (dollars)	
	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS
570	2.95	2.86 / 3.04	24.6	24.2 / 25.0	60.8	57.6 / 64.0	74.5	73.2 / 75.8	1.7	1.3 / 2.2	2.3	1.8 / 2.8	0.2	0.1 / 0.6	0.4	0.1 / 1.1	3.73	3.56 / 3.90	4.29	4.13 / 4.45	3.00	2.59 / 3.41
457	2.52	2.43 / 2.61	24.9	24.5 / 25.3	68.4	65.2 / 71.6	72.6	71.4 / 73.8	2.0	1.5 / 2.6	1.5	1.1 / 1.9	0.1	0.1 / 0.2	0.4	0.1 / 1.0	3.42	3.27 / 3.57	3.94	3.78 / 4.10	4.49	4.10 / 4.88
307	2.55	2.49 / 2.61	25.3	25.0 / 25.6	73.8	71.4 / 76.2	74.5	73.6 / 75.4	0.9	0.7 / 1.1	1.1	0.9 / 1.4	0.1	0.1 / 0.3	0.4	0.2 / 0.7	3.88	3.77 / 3.99	4.08	3.97 / 4.19	4.46	4.17 / 4.75
442	2.77	2.71 / 2.83	26.1	25.8 / 26.4	80.8	78.3 / 83.3	77.2	76.3 / 78.1	0.8	0.6 / 1.0	1.8	1.4 / 2.1	5.0	4.3 / 5.8	13.9	12.2 / 15.7	3.33	3.21 / 3.45	4.76	4.65 / 4.87	3.86	3.56 / 4.16
459	3.33	3.23 / 3.43	24.4	24.0 / 24.8	61.7	58.4 / 65.0	76.0	74.7 / 77.3	2.5	1.9 / 3.1	2.7	2.1 / 3.3	9.5	7.6 / 11.4	11.3	8.9 / 14.0	3.07	2.90 / 3.24	5.66	5.49 / 5.83	1.80	1.39 / 2.21
982	2.51	2.42 / 2.60	24.7	24.3 / 25.1	63.3	60.0 / 66.6	79.2	77.9 / 80.5	0.3	0.2 / 0.6	1.4	1.0 / 1.9	0.2	0.1 / 0.5	0.9	0.3 / 1.9	4.06	3.90 / 4.22	3.91	3.75 / 4.07	4.61	4.20 / 5.02
437	2.57	2.50 / 2.64	25.1	24.7 / 25.5	70.9	68.3 / 73.5	75.2	74.2 / 76.2	0.7	0.5 / 0.9	1.3	1.0 / 1.6	0.2	0.1 / 0.3	0.4	0.2 / 0.9	3.86	3.73 / 3.99	4.14	4.02 / 4.26	4.57	4.22 / 4.92
289	2.49	2.40 / 2.58	24.6	24.2 / 25.0	65.1	61.8 / 68.3	75.5	74.2 / 76.8	0.5	0.3 / 0.8	1.8	1.4 / 2.3	0.4	0.1 / 1.0	0.2	0.1 / 0.9	3.74	3.56 / 3.92	2.99	2.81 / 3.17	4.12	3.71 / 4.53
432	2.48	2.42 / 2.54	24.8	24.5 / 25.1	66.9	64.5 / 69.3	74.9	74.0 / 75.8	0.9	0.7 / 1.1	1.4	1.1 / 1.7	0.2	0.1 / 0.3	0.3	0.1 / 0.6	3.92	3.80 / 4.04	3.42	3.31 / 3.53	4.22	3.91 / 4.53
309	3.07	3.00 / 3.14	26.2	25.9 / 26.5	82.9	80.2 / 85.6	75.2	74.1 / 76.3	1.1	0.8 / 1.5	1.9	1.4 / 2.3	5.7	4.6 / 6.9	15.7	13.4 / 18.1	3.37	3.23 / 3.51	5.47	5.33 / 5.61	3.21	2.87 / 3.55
110	2.69	2.60 / 2.78	25.2	24.9 / 25.5	74.4	71.5 / 77.3	80.6	79.4 / 81.8	0.8	0.5 / 1.1	1.5	1.1 / 2.0	0.1	0.1 / 0.3	1.0	0.4 / 1.8	3.87	3.72 / 4.02	4.06	3.92 / 4.20	4.08	3.71 / 4.45
454	2.52	2.43 / 2.61	25.9	25.5 / 26.3	79.1	76.1 / 82.1	77.7	76.5 / 78.9	0.6	0.4 / 0.9	1.6	1.2 / 2.0	0.0	0.0 / 0.1	0.8	0.3 / 1.6	3.71	3.56 / 3.86	3.99	3.84 / 4.14	4.55	4.17 / 4.93
456	2.69	2.61 / 2.77	25.7	25.3 / 26.1	78.8	75.8 / 81.8	79.8	78.6 / 81.0	0.4	0.2 / 0.6	2.0	1.6 / 2.5	1.5	0.8 / 2.3	12.1	9.7 / 14.6	3.45	3.29 / 3.61	5.08	4.93 / 5.23	4.37	3.99 / 4.75

*If the confidence limits for two regressed means overlap, the two means are not significantly different at the 5% level.

7

Table 1.—Two-year combined summary: Regressed means and 80% confidence limits for traits by stocks entered (Continued)

STOCK CODE	BREEDER'S NAME AND ADDRESS	BREEDING	STRAIN OR TRADENAME	MORTALITY GROWING (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	MORTALITY GROWING 80% CONF. LIMITS	MORTALITY LAYING (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	MORTALITY LAYING 80% CONF. LIMITS	AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION (days) RE-GRESSED MEAN	AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION 80% CONF. LIMITS	EGG PRODUCTION HEN HOUSED (number) RE-GRESSED MEAN	HEN HOUSED 80% CONF. LIMITS	HEN-DAY (TO END OF TEST)(percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	HEN-DAY (TO END OF TEST) 80% CONF. LIMITS	HEN-DAY (LAST 30-60 DAYS)(percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	HEN-DAY (LAST 30-60 DAYS) 80% CONF. LIMITS	FEED PER DAY PER 100 LAYING HENS (pounds) RE-GRESSED MEAN	FEED 80% CONF. LIMITS
305	DeKalb-Warren, Inc. North Brookfield, MA 15350	RIRxRIW	BX Sex Sal Link-F	1.9	1.3 2.6	3.2	2.1 4.5	177	173 181	233	226 240	71.6	69.9 73.3	60.3	58.1 62.5	25.1	24.4 25.8
458	DeKalb AgResearch, Inc. DeKalb, IL 60115	--	INX DeKalb X-L Link	2.8	2.0 3.6	8.8	6.9 10.8	166	162 170	244	236 252	75.4	73.7 77.1	63.2	61.1 65.3	25.3	24.7 25.9
447	Euribrid, B. V. Boxmeer, Holland	WL	SX Hisex White	1.6	1.1 2.3	4.5	3.4 5.7	161	157 165	257	250 264	76.5	75.2 77.8	66.4	64.7 68.1	24.8	24.2 25.4
607	Fisher Poultry Farm, Ltd. Ayton, Ontario, Canada	WL	SX Fisher 107	1.8	1.2 2.4	6.3	4.9 7.9	169	165 173	232	225 239	71.0	69.6 72.4	62.4	60.5 64.3	24.4	23.8 25.0
608	Fisher Poultry Farm, Ltd. Ayton, Ontario, Canada	SYN	SYN Fisher 505	5.5	4.4 6.6	10.7	8.5 13.2	165	161 169	221	212 230	70.2	68.2 72.2	57.7	55.0 60.4	25.4	23.4 26.2
66	Garber Poultry Breeding Farm Modesto, CA 95351	WL	SX Garber G200	4.2	3.3 5.3	8.2	6.4 10.3	165	161 169	228	220 236	70.2	68.5 71.9	59.2	56.9 61.5	24.1	23.4 24.8
86	Hardy, C. Nelson & Son Essex, MA 01929	RIRxBPR	BX Deluxe Sex Link	2.8	2.1 3.6	5.8	4.1 7.8	171	167 175	222	213 231	68.1	65.9 70.3	58.0	55.2 60.8	****	**** ****
378	Hubbard Farms, Inc. Walpole, NH 03608	SYNxN.H.	BX Golden Comet	2.0	1.4 2.8	7.1	5.5 8.9	163	159 167	230	222 238	69.9	68.2 71.6	56.5	54.3 58.7	25.3	24.7 25.9
461	Hubbard Farms, Inc. Walpole, NH 03608	WL	SX Hubbard Leghorn	3.3	2.5 4.3	5.6	4.1 7.3	164	160 168	251	243 259	75.4	73.7 77.1	65.5	63.4 67.6	25.2	24.5 25.9
356	Ideal Poultry Breeding Farms Cameron, TX 76520	SYNxWL	BX Ideal 236	3.9	3.0 4.8	9.2	7.6 10.9	167	163 171	231	224 238	71.3	70.0 72.6	63.3	61.7 64.9	24.6	24.0 25.2
234	Indiana Farm Bureau Coop. Indianapolis, IN 46204	WL	SX Duchess 60	3.6	2.8 4.6	9.5	7.4 11.7	163	159 167	240	232 248	73.0	71.3 74.7	61.0	58.6 63.4	24.5	23.8 25.2
609	Nelson, George F. Truro, Nova Scotia, Canada	WL	BX Nelson 264	3.3	2.6 3.9	6.0	4.3 7.9	168	164 172	216	205 227	65.3	62.6 68.0	54.8	51.6 58.0	****	**** ****
37	N. Cent. Reg. Plty. Br. Lab. Lafayette, IN 47907	WL	PS Reg. Cornell Contr.	2.5	1.8 3.4	12.2	9.9 14.7	179	175 183	198	190 206	62.8	61.1 64.5	53.4	51.0 55.8	23.8	23.1 24.5

STOCK CODE	FEED PER POUND OF EGGS PRODUCED (pounds) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	EGG WEIGHT (oz./doz.) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	ALBUMEN QUALITY (Haugh units) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	BLOOD SPOTS 1/8 INCH OR MORE (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	LESS THAN 1/8 INCH (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	MEAT SPOTS 1/8 INCH OR MORE (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	LESS THAN 1/8 INCH (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	SPECIFIC GRAVITY SCORE RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	BODY WEIGHT (pounds) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS	INCOME OVER FEED & CHICK COST (dollars) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80%* CONF. LIMITS
305	2.69	2.62 / 2.76	26.9	26.6 / 27.2	86.0	83.3 / 88.7	79.3	78.1 / 80.5	0.7	0.4 / 1.0	1.9	1.5 / 2.4	4.4	3.5 / 5.5	11.3	9.3 / 13.5	3.49	3.34 / 3.64	4.99	4.85 / 5.13	4.15	3.80 / 4.50
458	2.59	2.51 / 2.67	25.2	24.8 / 25.6	71.9	68.8 / 75.0	78.8	77.6 / 80.0	0.4	0.2 / 0.6	1.5	1.2 / 1.9	0.1	0.1 / 0.3	0.6	0.2 / 1.1	3.77	3.63 / 3.91	4.19	4.03 / 4.35	4.32	3.93 / 4.71
447	2.44	2.38 / 2.50	25.2	24.9 / 25.5	72.3	69.9 / 74.7	75.0	74.1 / 75.9	1.0	0.8 / 1.3	1.2	1.0 / 1.5	0.2	0.1 / 0.4	0.3	0.1 / 0.7	3.69	3.57 / 3.81	3.90	3.78 / 4.02	5.14	4.82 / 5.46
607	2.60	2.53 / 2.67	25.6	25.3 / 25.9	78.0	75.3 / 80.7	77.2	76.2 / 78.2	0.3	0.2 / 0.4	1.4	1.1 / 1.8	0.3	0.1 / 0.5	0.7	0.3 / 1.2	3.67	3.54 / 3.80	4.04	3.91 / 4.17	4.17	3.84 / 4.50
608	2.90	2.81 / 2.99	25.1	24.7 / 25.5	69.1	65.9 / 72.3	74.1	72.9 / 75.3	0.7	0.4 / 1.0	4.0	3.3 / 4.7	2.4	1.5 / 3.4	9.3	7.0 / 11.9	3.75	3.58 / 3.92	5.33	5.17 / 5.49	3.14	2.73 / 3.55
66	2.68	2.60 / 2.76	24.5	24.2 / 24.8	64.4	61.5 / 67.3	77.3	76.2 / 78.4	0.1	0.1 / 0.3	0.9	0.6 / 1.3	0.2	0.1 / 0.5	0.5	0.2 / 1.1	3.93	3.78 / 4.08	4.07	3.93 / 4.21	4.14	3.73 / 4.55
86	2.95	2.85 / 3.05	26.2	25.7 / 26.7	85.6	82.3 / 88.9	74.0	72.5 / 75.5	1.1	0.8 / 1.5	2.5	2.1 / 2.9	6.5	4.6 / 8.6	8.3	5.5 / 11.6	3.30	3.12 / 3.48	5.32	5.11 / 5.53	3.59	3.16 / 4.02
378	2.64	2.57 / 2.71	26.3	25.9 / 26.7	81.7	78.9 / 84.5	75.7	74.6 / 76.8	0.7	0.4 / 1.0	1.6	1.3 / 2.1	5.9	4.9 / 7.1	13.4	11.4 / 15.6	3.38	3.24 / 3.52	4.59	4.46 / 4.72	4.26	3.91 / 4.61
461	2.53	2.45 / 2.61	25.4	25.0 / 25.8	73.2	70.0 / 76.4	76.4	75.2 / 77.6	1.6	1.2 / 2.0	1.6	1.4 / 2.3	0.2	0.1 / 0.4	0.3	0.1 / 0.8	3.64	3.49 / 3.79	4.24	4.09 / 4.39	4.64	4.24 / 5.04
356	2.58	2.52 / 2.64	25.6	25.3 / 25.9	76.3	73.9 / 78.7	73.0	72.0 / 74.0	0.5	0.4 / 0.7	1.3	1.1 / 1.6	0.2	0.1 / 0.4	0.3	0.1 / 0.6	3.56	3.44 / 3.68	4.38	4.26 / 4.50	4.02	3.71 / 4.33
234	2.57	2.48 / 2.66	24.6	24.2 / 25.0	63.8	60.9 / 66.7	81.0	79.8 / 82.2	0.5	0.3 / 0.7	1.3	0.9 / 1.7	0.3	0.1 / 0.6	0.2	0.1 / 0.6	3.77	3.62 / 3.92	4.02	3.87 / 4.17	4.40	4.03 / 4.77
609	2.86	2.73 / 2.99	26.2	25.7 / 26.7	82.3	78.3 / 86.3	75.6	74.2 / 77.0	1.3	1.0 / 1.7	2.1	1.8 / 2.4	4.6	2.9 / 6.7	11.1	7.2 / 15.7	3.70	3.53 / 3.87	4.96	4.74 / 5.18	3.43	2.96 / 3.90
37	3.20	3.12 / 3.28	24.0	23.6 / 24.4	57.0	54.2 / 59.8	74.7	73.6 / 75.8	1.8	1.3 / 2.2	2.3	1.8 / 2.9	0.3	0.1 / 0.6	0.3	0.1 / 0.8	3.60	3.46 / 3.74	4.49	4.35 / 4.63	2.56	2.20 / 2.92

*If the confidence limits for two regressed means overlap, the two means are not significantly different at the 5% level.

9

Table 1.—Two-year combined summary: Regressed means and 80% confidence limits for traits by stocks entered *(Continued)*

STOCK CODE	STOCK BREEDER'S NAME AND ADDRESS	BREEDING	STRAIN OR TRADENAME	MORTALITY GROWING (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	MORTALITY LAYING (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION (days) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	HEN HOUSED (number) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	HEN-DAY (TO END OF TEST) (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	HEN-DAY (LAST 30-60 DAYS) (percent) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	FEED PER DAY PER 100 LAYING HENS (pounds) RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS
352	Parks Poultry Farm Altoona, PA 16601	WL	SX Keystone B-1-------	3.4	2.6 4.3	7.1	5.6 8.8	164	161 167	235	228 242	71.7	70.2 73.2	60.0	58.1 61.9	24.4	23.8 25.0
382	Parks Poultry Farm Altoona, PA 16601	RIRxWPR	BX Sil-Go-Links--------	2.8	2.0 3.7	5.4	3.8 7.2	172	168 176	215	207 223	66.2	64.3 68.1	53.9	51.4 56.4	24.4	23.7 25.1
181	Shaver Poultry Breeding Farm Cambridge, Ontario, Canada	WL	SX Starcross 288------	3.0	2.3 3.8	3.9	2.9 4.9	163	159 167	258	252 264	77.1	75.9 78.3	65.1	63.0 66.6	25.4	24.9 25.9
451	Shaver Poultry Breeding Farm Cambridge, Ontario, Canada	RIR	SX Starcross 579------	3.1	2.5 3.8	2.7	1.6 4.2	168	164 172	237	226 248	71.4	68.9 73.9	59.9	56.8 63.0	****	**** ****
401	Tatum Farms Dawsonville, GA 30534	WL	SX Tatum T-100--------	2.7	2.0 3.6	10.7	8.7 12.7	166	162 170	228	221 235	70.1	68.6 71.6	60.9	58.9 62.9	24.5	23.8 25.2
449	Tatum Farms Dawsonville, GA 30534	RIRxSYN	BX Tatum T-173--------	2.4	1.7 3.2	3.9	2.8 5.3	175	171 179	214	207 221	65.4	63.9 66.9	51.6	49.5 53.7	23.9	23.2 24.6
440	Welp's Poultry Breeding Farm Bancroft, IA 50517	RIR	SX Welp Line 650 N----	2.6	1.9 3.4	3.9	2.6 5.5	167	163 171	230	221 239	68.4	66.3 70.5	54.8	52.0 57.6	25.1	24.3 25.9
460	Welp's Poultry Breeding Farm Bancroft, IA 50517	WL	SX Welp Line 975------	3.5	2.6 4.4	9.9	7.9 12.1	165	161 169	213	205 221	65.3	63.6 67.0	53.3	51.1 55.5	22.9	22.3 23.6

10

STOCK CODE	FEED PER POUND OF EGGS PRODUCED (pounds)		EGG WEIGHT (oz./doz.)		LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (percent)		ALBUMEN QUALITY (Haugh units)		BLOOD SPOTS 1/8 INCH OR MORE (percent)		BLOOD SPOTS LESS THAN 1/8 INCH (percent)		MEAT SPOTS 1/8 INCH OR MORE (percent)		MEAT SPOTS LESS THAN 1/8 INCH (percent)		SPECIFIC GRAVITY SCORE		BODY WEIGHT (pounds)		INCOME OVER FEED & CHICK COST (dollars)	
	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS	RE-GRESSED MEAN	80% CONF. LIMITS
352	2.61	2.54 2.68	24.9	24.5 25.3	68.1	65.5 70.7	76.7	75.7 77.7	0.6	0.4 0.8	1.5	1.1 1.9	0.1	0.1 0.3	0.5	0.2 0.9	3.85	3.72 3.98	4.00	3.88 4.12	4.19	3.84 4.54
382	2.86	2.77 2.95	26.1	25.8 26.4	79.3	76.3 82.3	77.2	76.0 78.4	1.1	0.7 1.5	2.1	1.6 2.6	2.2	1.4 3.2	10.7	8.5 13.3	3.40	3.24 3.56	5.00	4.85 5.15	3.39	3.01 3.77
181	2.45	2.39 2.51	25.9	25.6 26.2	80.0	77.7 82.3	78.5	77.5 79.5	0.4	0.3 0.6	1.4	1.2 1.7	0.1	0.1 0.2	0.4	0.2 0.8	3.79	3.68 3.90	4.17	4.06 4.28	5.14	4.84 5.44
451	2.70	2.59 2.81	26.4	25.9 26.9	89.5	85.7 93.3	74.5	73.0 76.0	0.7	0.5 1.0	1.7	1.4 2.0	0.5	0.1 1.3	1.0	0.2 2.8	3.24	3.06 3.42	4.95	4.69 5.21	4.42	3.96 4.88
401	2.67	2.59 2.75	25.1	24.8 25.4	71.6	68.9 74.3	77.9	76.8 79.0	1.4	1.1 1.8	1.5	1.2 1.9	0.3	0.1 0.5	0.4	0.1 0.7	3.32	3.19 3.45	4.06	3.93 4.19	3.93	3.59 4.27
449	2.84	2.76 2.92	25.4	25.1 25.7	74.5	71.7 77.3	78.4	77.4 79.4	2.0	1.6 2.5	3.7	3.1 4.4	4.1	3.3 5.1	7.9	6.4 9.6	3.30	3.17 3.43	5.00	4.87 5.13	3.38	3.04 3.72
440	2.88	2.78 2.98	25.4	25.0 25.8	76.3	73.0 79.6	75.0	73.6 76.4	0.7	0.4 1.1	1.4	1.1 1.8	6.5	4.8 8.4	25.2	21.3 29.4	3.24	3.06 3.42	4.88	4.70 5.06	3.89	3.47 4.31
460	2.74	2.65 2.83	24.5	24.1 24.9	62.6	59.4 65.8	74.8	73.6 76.0	1.5	1.1 1.9	1.7	1.3 2.2	0.1	0.1 0.2	0.5	0.2 1.1	3.48	3.33 3.63	3.95	3.79 4.11	3.34	2.94 3.74

*If the confidence limits for two regressed means overlap, the two means are not significantly different at the 5% level

11

PROCEDURES USED FOR COMPUTING COMBINED SUMMARY VALUES

Statistical Methods

The two-year combined summary includes performance data on 28 stocks that were entered in both the 1974-75 and 1975-76 tests and on 6 stocks that were entered only in the 1975-76 tests. Birds were tested at 19 locations in 1974-75 and at 17 locations in 1975-76. Table 3 lists the locations. Certain traits were not measured at some of the locations. These are identified with an NR (not reported) in the appropriate columns in table 3.

Replicate data were reported by 19 locations in 1974-75 and by 17 locations in 1975-76. The number of pens and the number of stocks tested at each location for the two years are given in table 3.

The percentage data for both years for the six traits--growing mortality, laying mortality, large blood spots, small blood spots, large meat spots, and small meat spots--were converted to angles with the arcsin transformation prior to analysis. However, the test-year adjustment factors shown in table 3 and the regressed means and confidence limits shown for these traits in table 1 are given in percent.

The replicate data were analyzed by least-squares procedures to obtain the test-year adjustment factors shown in table 3 and the repeatability estimates and the correlations among pens within tests shown in table 2. The test-year adjustment factors were then used to adjust the simple stock average for test and year effects. The adjusted stock averages (the least-squares stock means) were then regressed toward the overall mean ($\hat{\mu}$) to account for variations in number of tests entered, number of years entered, and number of replicates per test. The formula used to compute the regressed mean is:

$$\text{Regressed Mean} = \hat{\mu} + \frac{r_{2/C}}{1+(k_3-1)x_1+(k_1-k_3)x_2+(k_2-k_3)r_1+ (1/C)-k_1-k_2+k_3 \ r_2}(s)$$

where:

$\hat{\mu}$ = the average of the test and year adjusted stock means.

r_1 = repeatability within year.

r_2 = repeatability from year-to-year.

x_1 = the correlation among replicates within year and test.

x_2 = the correlation among pens of the same stock from year-to-year for the same test.

k_1 = an average of the number of pens per test (averaged over years).

k_2 = an average of the number of pens per year (averaged over tests).

k_3 = an average of the number of replicates per test-year subclass.

C = the diagonal inverse element for that stock. The reciprocal of C, i.e., $\frac{1}{C}$, is equal to nk_3 if the assumption is made that the adjustments for test-year effects are made without error; where n is the number of test-year subclasses in which that stock is entered.

s = the test-year adjusted stock average minus the overall mean $\hat{\mu}$

The correlations used in computing the regression coefficient were obtained from estimates of the variance components for stocks ($\hat{\sigma}_s^2$), the stock-X-test interaction ($\hat{\sigma}_{st}^2$), the stock-X-year interaction ($\hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2$), and the random error ($\hat{\sigma}_e^2$). The variance component estimates were obtained by equating the computed mean squares for these effects to their expectations. The mean squares for stocks were adjusted for the test-year subclass effects and the mean squares for the stock-X-test interaction and the stock-X-year interaction were adjusted by least-squares procedures for the effects of stocks and the test-year subclasses. The three-factor interaction was assumed to be non-existent. Ratios of the variance component estimates that were used to compute the correlations follow:

$$\text{Correlation Among Replicates} = x_1 = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{st}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{st}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_e^2}$$

$$\text{Correlations from Year-to-Year (same test)} = x_2 = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{st}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{st}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_e^2}$$

$$\text{Repeatability from Test-to-Test (within year)} = r_1 = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{st}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_e^2}$$

$$\text{Repeatability from Test-to-Test (between years)} = r_2 = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_s^2}{\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{st}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_e^2}$$

An approximate standard error (SE) was computed for each regressed mean as follows:

$$SE = b \sqrt{C(\hat{\sigma}_e^2 + k_1\hat{\sigma}_{st}^2 + k_2\hat{\sigma}_{sy}^2)}$$

where b is the regression coefficient given above in the formula for the regressed mean. Confidence limits were then computed for each regressed mean as follows:

$$\text{Regressed Mean} \pm 1.3 \text{ SE}$$

The constant 1.3 was selected in order that the probability of the confidence limits overlapping by chance alone between any two means would be about 0.03. This makes the test of significance among regressed means almost comparable to using Duncan's range test at the 0.05 level of probability.

Definition of Statistical Terms

The following definitions will help the reader interpret the analytical procedures:

Overall mean — The average of the test-year adjusted means for all stocks. This is an estimate of what the overall average would have been had all stocks been entered in all tests in both years.

Range — The range represents the difference between the expected maximum and minimum performance among the 50* stocks, based on the regressed means.

Common stocks — Stocks that are being tested at more than one location.

Test-year adjustment factor. — The amount added to or subtracted from the actual performance of the stocks at a given location in a given year to bring them to the average of all the location-year subclasses that had complete data. These factors were determined on an intrastock basis with a least-squares analysis, and they are given in table 3.

Repeatability within year — An intraclass correlation that measures the tendency for common stocks to rank the same from test-to-test within year. Theoretically, it can vary from 0.00 to 1.00.

Repeatability between years — A correlation which measures the tendency for common stocks to rank the same from test-to-test from one year to another. The difference between the repeatability within year and repeatability between years indicates the relative importance of the stock-by-year interaction.

Correlation among replicates — This correlation measures the repeatability among replicates of the same stock in the same test and year. The higher the correlation among replicates the less need there is for replication of stocks within test and year.

Correlation from year-to-year within tests — A correlation which measures the tendency for common stock to rank the same from year-to-year when tested at the same location. The difference in the repeatability between years and in the correlation from year-to-year within tests indicates the relative importance of the stock-by-test interaction.

Confidence limits — The confidence limits for each regressed mean are computed so that the probability is about 0.80 that the "true" stock mean lies within the interval. They are presented in this report, however, for the purpose of providing approximate tests of significance for differences among stocks.

*Includes 16 experimental stocks.

TABLE 2.--Analytical data for the traits measured
1974-75 and 1975-76

Traits	Overall means	Regressed means		Repeatability		Correlations within test	
		Min.	Max.	Within year (r_1)	Year-to-year (r_2)	Among replicates (x_1)	Year-to-year (x_2)
Growing mortality----------percent-	2.5	1.65	5.47	0.3059	0.1836	0.3059	0.1836
Laying mortality----------percent-	7.3	2.74	13.83	.2346	.2028	.3057	.2738
Age at 50% production--------days-	165	161	179	.5505	.4300	.7704	.6499
Hen-housed egg production---number-	234.7	186	258	.6199	.5731	.7200	.6732
Hen-day egg production to end of test----------------percent-	71.5	62.8	77.2	.6277	.5922	.7273	.6917
Hen-day egg production last 30 to 60 days--------------percent-	60.6	51.6	67.5	.4719	.4455	.5862	.5598
Feed per 100 birds per day--pounds-	24.3	22.4	26.2	.5399	.4664	.6927	.6191
Feed per pound of eggs------pounds-	2.68	2.44	3.33	.6758	.6333	.7464	.7039
Egg weight-----------ounces/dozen-	25.4	24.0	26.9	.7379	.6287	.8183	.7092
Large and extra large eggs-percent-	70.9	57.0	89.5	.7431	.6547	.8420	.7536
Albumen quality--------Haugh units-	76.5	72.6	81.0	.5822	.4965	.6674	.5817
Large blood spots----------percent-	.8	.14	2.50	.1790	.1742	.2205	.2157
Small blood spots----------percent-	1.8	.94	3.97	.1192	.1164	.2074	.2046
Large meat spots-----------percent-	.3	0.00	9.54	.6038	.5935	.7237	.7134
Small meat spots-----------percent-	1.2	0.00	25.24	.7851	.7645	.8558	.8352
Specific gravity------------score-	4.0	3.01	4.18	.4350	.3852	.5727	.5230
Body weight----------------pounds-	4.20	2.99	5.66	.8364	.8024	.8698	.8358
Income over feed and chick cost--------------------dollars-	4.43	1.80	5.14	.5747	.5009	.7254	.6516

NOTE: The values for these factors are based on the 34 commercially available stocks as well as the 16 experimental stocks that were tested. The individual performance data for the experimental entries were analyzed but not published in this report.

TABLE 3.--Factors used to adjust for test differences

Test	Pens (number)		Stocks tested (number)		Mortality (percent)			
					Growing period		Laying period	
	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976
Central Canada No. 6 - (2/cage) ---	48	48	12	12	-.40	+.38	-1.74	-1.07
Central Canada No. 7 - (2/cage) ---	48	48	12	12	-.41	+.07	-1.47	-1.33
Florida No. 7 - Floor-------------	24	24	12	12	-.08	+.23	+.19	+.43
Florida No. 8 - (2/cage) ----------	48	48	12	12	-.08	+.23	+.23	+.29
Florida No. 9 - Floor-------------	24	24	12	12	-.08	+.23	+1.53	+.42
Florida No. 10 - (2/cage) ---------	48	48	12	12	-.08	+.23	+.39	+.29
Missouri Cage - (8/cage) ----------	54	--	9	--	+.04	--	-.05	--
Missouri Floor--------------------	56	--	14	--	+.65	--	-1.95	--
New Hampshire No. 7 - (3/cage) ----	138	184	17	23	+.01	+.11	-1.80	-.05
New Hampshire No. 4 - Floor-------	24	24	8	8	-.18	+.06	-.61	+1.26
North Carolina No. 3 - Floor------	20	20	10	10	+.36	+.25	+.25	+.04
North Carolina No. 4 - (2/cage) ---	40	20	10	10	+.17	+.01	+.07	-.01
North Carolina No. 5 - (7/cage) ---	20	20	10	10	+.13	+.12	-1.06	-3.55
Pennsylvania No. 1 - Floor--------	48	48	24	24	+.44	+1.15	+.01	+.15
Pennsylvania No. 2 - (3/cage) -----	48	48	24	24	+.44	+1.15	+.10	+.01
Tennessee No. 5 - (2/cage) --------	24	28	12	14	-1.63	-.09	+.06	+.19
Tennessee No. 6 - (2/cage) --------	24	28	12	14	-1.63	-.09	+.63	+.02
Tennessee No. 7 - (2/cage) --------	24	28	12	14	-1.63	-.09	+.10	+.01
Tennessee No. 8 - (2/cage) --------	24	28	12	14	-1.63	-.09	+.01	+.02

TABLE 3.--Factors used to adjust for test differences--Continued

Test	Age at 50 percent production (days)		Egg production					
			Hen-housed (number)		Hen-day (to end of test) (percent)		Hen-day (last 30-60 days) (percent)	
	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976
Central Canada No. 6 - (2/cage)---	+4.95	+4.44	+4.40	+2.82	-.31	+.55	+1.32	-3.48
Central Canada No. 7 - (2/cage)---	+3.34	+9.73	+1.15	+5.22	-1.57	+.88	-.81	-1.58
Florida No. 7 - Floor------------	-.98	-.08	-2.29	-1.86	-1.03	-.48	+1.51	+1.07
Florida No. 8 - (2/cage)----------	-.85	+.31	-3.57	-1.61	-1.49	-.70	+.87	-.10
Florida No. 9 - Floor------------	-.44	-.16	-10.09	-2.57	-2.62	-.74	-.91	+.76
Florida No. 10 - (2/cage)---------	-.90	+.52	+.33	+1.22	-.33	-.13	+2.79	-.03
Missouri Cage - (8/cage)----------	-15.61	--	+7.41	--	+2.30	--	-2.12	--
Missouri Floor--------------------	-9.12	--	+2.72	--	+.91	--	-2.89	--
New Hampshire No. 7 - (3/cage)----	+3.75	+10.43	-4.03	-7.13	-3.56	-.32	-2.02	+2.45
New Hampshire No. 4 - Floor-------	+2.32	+12.30	+26.42	-20.48	+6.69	-2.92	+14.87	+.39
North Carolina No. 3 - Floor------	-8.21	-9.10	-13.37	-20.54	-5.51	-7.32	-1.51	-5.40
North Carolina No. 4 - (2/cage)---	-11.33	-9.25	-2.41	-3.92	-3.01	-3.18	-3.33	-3.26
North Carolina No. 5 - (7/cage)---	-15.16	-10.75	+13.88	+17.87	-.89	-1.46	-3.29	+2.09
Pennsylvania No. 1 - Floor-------	+.88	+5.70	+.60	-9.00	+.28	-1.54	+3.33	-4.27
Pennsylvania No. 2 - (3/cage)-----	-3.44	+4.72	+8.97	+.30	+3.71	+1.33	+1.93	-1.67
Tennessee No. 5 - (2/cage)--------	+2.14	-.50	+3.62	+1.15	+4.96	+1.73	-1.87	+2.60
Tennessee No. 6 - (2/cage)--------	+2.18	-.50	+1.15	+3.29	+5.21	+1.70	-2.15	-.25
Tennessee No. 7 - (2/cage)--------	+2.55	-.50	+.77	+3.70	+4.44	+1.16	-2.67	+2.01
Tennessee No. 8 - (2/cage)--------	+2.39	-.50	+1.71	+4.31	+4.91	+1.51	-1.46	+2.04

TABLE 3.--Factors used to adjust for test differences--Continued

Test	Feed per pound of eggs (pounds)		Feed per 100 birds per day (pounds)		Egg weight (oz./dozen)		Large and extra large eggs (percent)	
	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976
Central Canada No. 6 - (2/cage)---	+.09	+.06	+1.55	--	+1.47	+.63	+25.12	+13.80
Central Canada No. 7 - (2/cage)---	+.09	+.07	+1.32	--	+1.32	+.84	+23.30	+16.90
Florida No. 7 - Floor-------------	+.12	+.05	+1.26	+.11	+.34	-.30	-.31	-7.41
Florida No. 8 - (2/cage)----------	+.26	+.20	+1.94	+.80	-.21	-1.10	-7.92	-14.20
Florida No. 9 - Floor-------------	+.14	+.04	+.75	-.20	+.23	-.44	-1.93	-9.13
Florida No. 10 - (2/cage)---------	+.24	+.20	+2.16	+.95	-.21	-1.09	-7.74	-15.23
Missouri Cage - (8/cage)----------	-.17	--	--	--	-.37	--	-18.35	--
Missouri Floor-------------------	-.49	--	-.39	--	-.08	--	-10.65	--
New Hampshire No. 7 - (3/cage)----	-.09	-.12	--	--	+.81	+1.24	+16.19	+22.11
New Hampshire No. 4 - Floor-------	-.46	+.10	--	--	+1.03	+1.90	+19.17	+26.83
North Carolina No. 3 - Floor------	+.16	+.24	-.35	+.17	-.94	-.77	-12.53	-9.00
North Carolina No. 4 - (2/cage)---	+.10	+.15	-.36	+.35	-1.49	-1.08	-14.86	-10.79
North Carolina No. 5 - (7/cage)---	+.04	+.10	+.12	+.85	-1.38	-.77	-14.91	-8.76
Pennsylvania No. 1 - Floor--------	-.18	-.16	-2.82	-2.93	-.64	-.35	+.15	+4.78
Pennsylvania No. 2 - (3/cage)-----	-.21	-.12	-1.26	-1.54	-.49	-.03	+.75	+5.61
Tennessee No. 5 - (2/cage)--------	-.13	-.15	+1.65	--	+.25	-.04	-4.88	-7.83
Tennessee No. 6 - (2/cage)--------	-.17	-.17	+1.38	--	+.34	+.20	-3.31	-3.57
Tennessee No. 7 - (2/cage)--------	-.07	-.16	+1.86	--	+.19	+.03	-5.45	-6.49
Tennessee No. 8 - (2/cage)--------	-.08	-.17	+1.97	--	+.42	+.08	-2.83	-5.66

TABLE 3.--Factors used to adjust for test differences--Continued

Test	Albumen quality (Haugh units)		Blood spots 1/8 inch or more (percent)		Blood spots less than 1/8 inch (percent)		Meat spots 1/8 inch or more (percent)	
	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976
Central Canada No. 6 - (2/cage)---	+.73	-.01	-.18	-.25	-.19	-.25	+.03	+.01
Central Canada No. 7 - (2/cage)---	+.26	-.02	-.14	-.17	-.13	-.26	+.03	+.01
Florida No. 7 - Floor-------------	-2.11	+1.65	-.01	+.02	-.01	-.05	+.06	+.09
Florida No. 8 - (2/cage)----------	-1.32	+1.00	+.03	+.08	-.04	+.01	+.08	+.06
Florida No. 9 - Floor-------------	-3.50	+2.30	-.01	+.01	-.04	-.09	+.11	+.03
Florida No. 10 - (2/cage)---------	-2.84	+.53	-.08	+.01	-.03	-.01	+.07	+.03
Missouri Cage - (8/cage)----------	+2.50	--	-.01	--	-.72	--	+.07	--
Missouri Floor--------------------	-1.69	--	-.01	--	-.33	--	+.16	--
New Hampshire No. 7 - (3/cage)----	-3.53	+.14	+.20	+.39	+.40	+.42	-.01	+.24
New Hampshire No. 4 - Floor-------	+.05	-.14	+.65	+.27	+.32	-.02	+.01	+.06
North Carolina No. 3 - Floor------	+.73	-.50	-.06	-.01	+.03	+.01	-.63	-.27
North Carolina No. 4 - (2/cage)---	-3.52	-1.48	-.04	-.06	+.02	+.01	-.42	-.42
North Carolina No. 5 - (7/cage)---	-3.90	-.33	-.02	+.01	+.07	-.01	-.45	-.13
Pennsylvania No. 1 - Floor--------	-3.29	-4.60	-.02	+.01	+.03	+.03	+.35	+.11
Pennsylvania No. 2 - (3/cage)-----	-3.32	-3.70	-.11	+.01	+.01	+.07	+.20	+.15
Tennessee No. 5 - (2/cage)--------	+1.51	+4.92	+.02	-.01	+.16	-.11	+.03	-.03
Tennessee No. 6 - (2/cage)--------	+1.46	+6.06	+.12	-.12	+.06	-.18	-.07	-.56
Tennessee No. 7 - (2/cage)--------	+1.52	+6.96	-.04	+.04	-.19	+.01	+.02	-.03
Tennessee No. 8 - (2/cage)--------	+2.35	+5.93	+.04	-.05	+.11	+.07	+.01	-.04

TABLE 3.--Factors used to adjust for test differences--Continued

Test	Meat spots less than 1/8 inch (percent)		Specific gravity score		Body weight (pounds)		Income over feed and chick cost (dollars)	
	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976	1975	1976
Central Canada No. 6 - (2/cage)---	-.19	-.01	+.99	+.71	+.20	+.39	+.95	+.29
Central Canada No. 7 - (2/cage)---	-.16	-.01	+.95	+.82	+.25	+.36	+.79	+.39
Florida No. 7 - Floor-------------	+.15	+.10	-1.08	-1.10	+.11	+.03	NR*	NR*
Florida No. 8 - (2/cage)----------	+.25	+.17	-1.31	-1.57	+.06	+.13	NR*	NR*
Florida No. 9 - Floor-------------	+.23	+.10	-1.18	-1.22	+.12	+.02	NR*	NR*
Florida No. 10 - (2/cage)---------	+.22	+.28	-1.59	-1.58	+.06	+.12	NR*	NR*
Missouri Cage - (8/cage)----------	+.19	--	-.43	--	+.09	--	+1.53	--
Missouri Floor--------------------	-.34	--	-.33	--	+.04	--	+1.52	--
New Hampshire No. 7 - (3/cage)----	-4.42	-1.61	+1.75	+1.42	+.11	+.20	-1.49	-2.36
New Hampshire No. 4 - Floor-------	-4.49	-2.90	+1.44	+1.23	-.10	-.05	-.35	-3.10
North Carolina No. 3 - Floor------	+.02	+.01	+.90	+1.65	-.40	-.13	+.50	+.40
North Carolina No. 4 - (2/cage)---	+.13	+.03	+.72	+1.71	-.31	+.15	+1.11	+1.14
North Carolina No. 5 - (7/cage)---	+.22	-.01	+.55	+1.48	-.13	+.18	+1.60	+1.62
Pennsylvania No. 1 - Floor--------	+.04	+.20	-1.79	-2.03	-.26	-.16	+.88	-.84
Pennsylvania No. 2 - (3/cage)-----	+.10	+.04	-1.86	-2.00	-.28	-.22	+1.12	-.73
Tennessee No. 5 - (2/cage)--------	+.23	+.10	+.13	+.14	+.03	-.26	+.31	-.88
Tennessee No. 6 - (2/cage)--------	+.36	+.01	+.30	+.13	+.11	-.02	+.30	-.79
Tennessee No. 7 - (2/cage)--------	+.18	+.05	+.44	+.26	-.05	-.17	+.28	-.74
Tennessee No. 8 - (2/cage)-------	+.04	+.03	+.36	+.30	-.02	-.06	+.35	-.72

* Data for this trait not reported.

How Group Rankings Were Determined for Each Trait

The information in this section deals only with the test data obtained during the 1975-76 test year.

The performance of each entry in the 7 Random Sample Egg Production Tests conducted during 1975-76 is reported as the Range Group Rank of the entry for the trait measured. These rankings were determined in the following manner. For each trait the entries in each test were alined in descending order of performance from the most desirable to the least desirable. The "mean" or average performance for the trait was then determined. All entries above the mean are in range group 1 or 2, and those below the mean are in range group 3 or 4. The dividing point for the entries above or below the mean is the midpoint of the range between the mean and the top or bottom entry. An illustration follows:

Stocks entered in the Pennsylvania test laid a mean, or average, of 239.70 eggs per pullet housed. The largest number of eggs laid by an entry was 268.90 and the lowest number was 207.50 eggs. To arrive at the dividing point between the first and second range groups, the mean (239.70 eggs) was subtracted from the largest number of eggs produced (268.90). The result, 29.20 eggs, was divided by two to get the midpoint of the range (14.60 eggs). This was subtracted from the top entry (268.90-14.60) to arrive at the dividing point (254.30 eggs) between the first and second range groups. To determine the dividing point between the third and the fourth range groups, the same procedure was used, except that the lowest number of eggs produced (207.50) was subtracted from the mean (239.70 eggs). This difference, or range, (32.20 eggs) was then divided by two and the result (16.10 eggs) was subtracted from the mean (239.70-16.10) to get the dividing point (223.60 eggs) between the third and fourth range groups. These determinations for ten traits are tabulated in table 4.

The breeders of the stock tested and the Range Group Ranking, by traits, of each entry of the stock are shown in table 5. Each entry is also identified by the abbreviated name of the entrant. If the sample was drawn from a source other than the entrant's hatchery or supply flock, the abbreviated name of the source of the sample is shown in parentheses following the entrant's name.

The listing of the entries in the four range groups, with all entries of each stock in one table, allows the reader to evaluate quickly a stock based on this method of analysis. It should be kept in mind, however, that this method provides just four broad classifications. One-tenth of an egg or one-tenth of a percent difference in mortality could move an entry up or down one Range Group Rank, depending on its place in the range grouping.

Tabular Listing of Stock Entered in Tests

The listing of all stocks entered in the 1975-76 Random Sample Egg Production Tests is given in table 6. This listing will permit the reader to see at a glance the abbreviated name of the breeder of the stock, the strain or trade name of the stock, and the total number of entries of each stock which were tested during 1975-76. The tests in which each stock was entered are also given.

Management and Environmental Conditions at Tests

Some of the more important management and environmental conditions found in the individual tests during the 1975-76 testing year are found in table 7. Other conditions at the various testing stations were undoubtedly different. However, the important consideration is that all entries at a given location were treated as nearly alike as possible.

TABLE 4.--Upper and lower limits for each range group by traits and tests, 1975-1976

Traits measured	Tests	
	Central Canada	Florida
Income over feed and chick cost;		
Average-----dol./hen housed-	4.105	
Range group 1--------------	5.160 - 4.632	
Range group 2--------------	4.631 - 4.105	Not Reported
Range group 3--------------	4.104 - 3.227	
Range group 4--------------	3.226 - 2.350	
Egg production;		
Average---number/hen housed-	236.82	238.59
Range group 1--------------	259.20 - 248.01	260.60 - 249.59
Range group 2--------------	248.00 - 236.82	249.58 - 238.59
Range group 3--------------	236.81 - 220.26	238.58 - 220.34
Range group 4--------------	220.25 - 203.70	220.33 - 202.10
Age at 50 percent production;		
Average---------------days-	156.5	164.2
Range group 1--------------	152.0 - 154.2	160.0 - 162.1
Range group 2--------------	154.3 - 156.5	162.2 - 164.2
Range group 3--------------	156.6 - 159.7	164.3 - 167.1
Range group 4--------------	159.8 - 163.0	167.2 - 170.0
Growing mortality;		
Average-----------percent-	2.90	1.76
Range group 1--------------	1.20 - 2.05	0.20 - 0.98
Range group 2--------------	2.06 - 2.90	.99 - 1.76
Range group 3--------------	2.91 - 3.45	1.77 - 2.28
Range group 4--------------	3.46 - 4.00	2.29 - 2.80
Laying mortality;		
Average-----------percent--	12.91	5.77
Range group 1--------------	8.30 - 10.60	2.20 - 3.98
Range group 2--------------	10.61 - 12.91	3.99 - 5.77
Range group 3--------------	12.92 - 17.00	5.78 - 8.03
Range group 4--------------	17.01 - 21.10	8.04 - 10.30
Egg weight;		
Average--------ounces/dozen-	24.48	25.95
Range group 1--------------	25.00 - 24.74	26.90 - 26.42
Range group 2--------------	24.73 - 24.48	26.41 - 25.95
Range group 3--------------	24.47 - 24.04	25.94 - 25.52
Range group 4--------------	24.03 - 23.60	25.51 - 25.10
Large and extra large eggs;		
Average-----------percent--	55.96	83.72
Range group 1--------------	64.20 - 60.08	91.50 - 87.61
Range group 2--------------	60.07 - 55.96	87.60 - 83.72
Range group 3--------------	55.95 - 49.03	83.71 - 78.61
Range group 4--------------	49.02 - 42.10	78.60 - 73.50
Feed per pound of eggs;		
Average-----------pounds--	2.521	2.419
Range group 1--------------	2.380 - 2.450	2.310 - 2.364
Range group 2--------------	2.451 - 2.521	2.365 - 2.419
Range group 3--------------	2.522 - 2.715	2.420 - 2.544
Range group 4--------------	2.716 - 2.910	2.545 - 2.670
Albumen quality;		
Average---------Haugh units-	75.95	75.12
Range group 1--------------	80.90 - 78.42	79.20 - 77.16
Range group 2--------------	78.41 - 75.95	77.15 - 75.12
Range group 3--------------	75.94 - 74.42	75.11 - 73.61
Range group 4--------------	74.41 - 72.90	73.60 - 72.10
Blood spots, all sizes;		
Average-----------percent--	5.48	3.02
Range group 1--------------	2.20 - 3.84	1.70 - 2.36
Range group 2--------------	3.85 - 5.48	2.37 - 3.02
Range group 3--------------	5.49 - 7.74	3.03 - 3.81
Range group 4--------------	7.75 - 10.00	3.82 - 4.60

Traits measured	Tests	
	New Hampshire Cage	New Hampshire Floor
Income over feed and chick cost;		
Average-----dol./hen housed-	6.540	7.012
Range group 1---------------	7.770 - 7.155	8.650 - 7.831
Range group 2---------------	7.154 - 6.540	7.830 - 7.012
Range group 3---------------	6.539 - 5.805	7.011 - 6.481
Range group 4---------------	5.804 - 5.070	6.480 - 5.950
Egg production;		
Average---number/hen housed-	241.42	250.76
Range group 1---------------	266.60 - 254.01	286.20 - 268.48
Range group 2---------------	254.00 - 241.42	268.47 - 250.76
Range group 3---------------	241.41 - 227.36	250.75 - 238.43
Range group 4---------------	227.35 - 213.30	238.42 - 226.10
Age at 50 percent production;		
Average--------------days-	157.8	158.7
Range group 1---------------	150.0 - 153.9	154.0 - 156.3
Range group 2---------------	154.0 - 157.8	156.4 - 158.7
Range group 3---------------	157.9 - 161.9	158.8 - 160.8
Range group 4---------------	162.0 - 166.0	160.9 - 163.0
Growing mortality;		
Average-----------percent--	1.80	2.02
Range group 1---------------	0.00 - 0.90	0.00 - 1.01
Range group 2---------------	.91 - 1.80	1.02 - 2.02
Range group 3---------------	1.81 - 2.90	2.03 - 3.16
Range group 4---------------	2.91 - 4.00	3.17 - 4.30
Laying mortality;		
Average-----------percent-	7.89	1.93
Range group 1---------------	2.60 - 5.24	0.00 - 0.96
Range group 2---------------	5.25 - 7.89	0.97 - 1.93
Range group 3---------------	7.90 - 12.04	1.94 - 3.76
Range group 4---------------	12.05 - 16.20	3.77 - 5.60
Egg weight;		
Average--------ounces/dozen-	24.50	24.12
Range group 1---------------	25.80 - 25.15	24.90 - 24.51
Range group 2---------------	25.14 - 24.50	24.50 - 24.12
Range group 3---------------	24.49 - 23.90	24.11 - 23.91
Range group 4---------------	23.89 - 23.30	23.90 - 23.70
Large and extra large eggs;		
Average-----------percent-	55.73	52.58
Range group 1---------------	72.70 - 64.21	59.10 - 55.84
Range group 2---------------	64.20 - 55.73	55.83 - 52.58
Range group 3---------------	55.72 - 45.76	52.57 - 48.99
Range group 4---------------	45.75 - 35.80	48.98 - 45.40
Feed per pound of eggs;		
Average-----------pounds-	2.797	2.676
Range group 1---------------	2.500 - 2.648	2.300 - 2.488
Range group 2---------------	2.649 - 2.797	2.489 - 2.676
Range group 3---------------	2.798 - 3.028	2.677 - 2.768
Range group 4---------------	3.029 - 3.260	2.769 - 2.860
Albumen quality;		
Average--------Haugh units-	75.74	77.27
Range group 1---------------	80.40 - 78.07	79.60 - 78.43
Range group 2---------------	78.06 - 75.74	78.42 - 77.27
Range group 3---------------	75.73 - 73.17	77.26 - 76.28
Range group 4---------------	73.16 - 70.60	76.27 - 75.30
Blood spots, all sizes;		
Average-----------percent-	1.36	4.70
Range group 1---------------	0.00 - 0.68	0.00 - 2.35
Range group 2---------------	.69 - 1.36	2.36 - 4.70
Range group 3---------------	1.37 - 5.78	4.71 - 8.60
Range group 4---------------	5.79 - 10.20	8.61 - 12.50

Traits measured	Tests		
	North Carolina	Pennsylvania	Tennessee
Income over feed and chick cost;			
Average-----dol./hen housed-	3.385	5.074	4.678
Range group 1---------------	4.110 – 3.747	6.400 – 5.737	6.250 – 5.464
Range group 2---------------	3.746 – 3.385	5.736 – 5.074	5.463 – 4.678
Range group 3---------------	3.384 – 2.612	5.073 – 4.342	4.677 – 3.279
Range group 4---------------	2.611 – 1.840	4.341 – 3.610	3.278 – 1.880
Egg production;			
Average---number/hen housed-	238.69	239.70	225.67
Range group 1---------------	257.30 – 247.99	268.90 – 254.30	261.50 – 243.58
Range group 2---------------	247.98 – 238.69	254.29 – 239.70	243.57 – 225.67
Range group 3---------------	238.68 – 228.84	239.69 – 223.60	225.66 – 199.58
Range group 4---------------	228.83 – 219.00	223.59 – 207.50	199.57 – 173.50
Age at 50 percent production;			
Average---------------days-	174.1	162.2	168.2
Range group 1---------------	166.0 – 170.0	152.0 – 157.1	160.0 – 164.1
Range group 2---------------	170.1 – 174.1	157.2 – 162.2	164.2 – 168.2
Range group 3---------------	174.2 – 179.0	162.3 – 177.6	168.3 – 172.1
Range group 4---------------	179.1 – 184.0	177.7 – 193.0	172.2 – 176.0
Growing mortality;			
Average-------------percent-	1.97	0.53	5.04
Range group 1---------------	0.30 – 1.13	0.00 – 0.26	0.00 – 2.52
Range group 2---------------	1.14 – 1.97	.27 – .53	2.53 – 5.04
Range group 3---------------	1.98 – 2.83	.54 – 1.06	5.05 – 8.27
Range group 4---------------	2.84 – 3.70	1.07 – 1.60	8.28 – 11.50
Laying mortality;			
Average-------------percent-	11.30	6.35	9.15
Range group 1---------------	5.90 – 8.60	1.60 – 3.97	2.10 – 5.62
Range group 2---------------	8.61 – 11.30	3.98 – 6.35	5.63 – 9.15
Range group 3---------------	11.31 – 18.10	6.36 – 10.57	9.16 – 14.57
Range group 4---------------	18.11 – 24.90	10.58 – 14.80	14.58 – 20.00
Egg weight;			
Average--------ounces/dozen-	26.46	25.52	25.00
Range group 1---------------	27.40 – 26.93	27.10 – 26.31	26.30 – 25.65
Range group 2---------------	26.92 – 26.46	26.30 – 25.52	25.64 – 25.00
Range group 3---------------	26.45 – 25.98	25.51 – 24.81	24.99 – 24.20
Range group 4---------------	25.97 – 25.50	24.80 – 24.10	24.19 – 23.40
Large and extra large eggs;			
Average-------------percent-	87.20	67.20	75.94
Range group 1---------------	92.50 – 89.85	81.60 – 74.40	88.40 – 82.17
Range group 2---------------	89.84 – 87.20	74.39 – 67.20	82.16 – 75.94
Range group 3---------------	87.19 – 84.45	67.19 – 56.35	75.93 – 66.57
Range group 4---------------	84.44 – 81.70	56.34 – 45.50	66.56 – 57.20
Feed per pound of eggs;			
Average-------------pounds-	2.466	2.755	2.857
Range group 1---------------	2.290 – 2.378	2.500 – 2.627	2.500 – 2.678
Range group 2---------------	2.379 – 2.466	2.628 – 2.755	2.679 – 2.857
Range group 3---------------	2.467 – 2.688	2.756 – 2.942	2.858 – 3.218
Range group 4---------------	2.689 – 2.910	2.943 – 3.130	3.219 – 3.580
Albumen quality;			
Average--------Haugh units-	77.49	80.76	69.83
Range group 1---------------	82.30 – 79.89	85.40 – 83.08	74.70 – 72.26
Range group 2---------------	79.88 – 77.49	83.07 – 80.76	72.25 – 69.83
Range group 3---------------	77.48 – 75.69	80.75 – 79.03	69.82 – 66.81
Range group 4---------------	75.68 – 73.90	79.02 – 77.30	66.80 – 63.80
Blood spots, all sizes;			
Average-------------percent-	2.43	2.29	5.49
Range group 1---------------	0.60 – 1.51	0.60 – 1.44	2.50 – 3.99
Range group 2---------------	1.52 – 2.43	1.45 – 2.29	4.00 – 5.49
Range group 3---------------	2.44 – 3.71	2.30 – 4.04	5.50 – 7.69
Range group 4---------------	3.72 – 5.00	4.05 – 5.80	7.70 – 9.90

TABLE 5.--Range group ranking for stock entered in 1975-76 random sample egg production tests

ENTRY IDENTIFICATION	TEST	BREEDING	STRAIN OR TRADENAME	INCOME OVER FEED AND CHICK COST ($)	EGG PRODUCTION (Hen housed) (No.)	AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION (Days)	GROWING MORTALITY (%)	LAYING MORTALITY (%)	EGG WEIGHT (oz)	LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (%)	FEED PER POUND OF EGGS (lbs)	ALBUMEN QUALITY (H.U.)	BLOOD SPOTS (%)
Animal Research Institute, Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0C6.													
A.R.I., Ont.———	C.C.	WL	PS	Kentville, R.B.C.—	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4
Anthony, George M. & Sons, Strausstown, Pennsylvania 19559.													
Anthony, Pa.———	Pa.	WL	SX	Anthony-76———	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	1	3	3
Anthony, Pa.———	Tenn.	WL	SX	Anthony-76———	2	2	1	4	3	3	3	2	4	3
Babcock Poultry Farm, Inc., P.O. Box 280, Ithaca, New York 14850.													
Babcock, N.Y. (Bartey, Ont.)———	C.C.	WL	IN	Babcock B-300———	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	4	1
Babcock, N.Y.———	Fla.	WL	IN	Babcock B-300———	-	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	4	2
Babcock, N.Y. (Harrold's, Ga.)———	N.H.-C.	WL	IN	Babcock B-300———	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	1	2	4
Babcock, N.Y.———	N.C.	WL	IN	Babcock B-300———	2	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	3	2
Babcock, N.Y. (Babcock, Pa.)———	Pa.	WL	IN	Babcock B-300———	2	2	1	3	3	3	2	2	4	3
Babcock, N.Y.———	Tenn.	WL	IN	Babcock B-300———	2	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	3	1
Babcock Poultry Farm, Inc., P.O. Box 280, Ithaca, New York 14850.													
Babcock, N.Y.———	N.H.-C.	WL	RIRxSYN BX	Babcock B-380———	2	1	2	4	1	2	2	3	2	1
Babcock, N.Y.———	N.H.-F.	WL	RIRxSYN BX	Babcock B-380———	3	3	4	2	1	3	1	4	2	2
Babcock, N.Y.———	N.C.	WL	RIRxSYN BX	Babcock B-380———	3	3	4	2	1	1	1	3	2	3
Babcock, N.Y.———	Pa.	WL	RIRxSYN BX	Babcock B-380———	4	3	3	1	1	1	1	4	2	2
Babcock, N.Y.———	Tenn.	WL	RIRxSYN BX	Babcock B-380———	2	2	4	1	1	1	1	2	1	3
Barr's Egg Farm, P.O. Box 4147, Knoxville, Tennessee 37921.													
Barr, Tenn.———	Tenn.	BPR	PS	Barr's Barred Rock	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4
Canada Department of Agriculture, Poultry Division, 510 Sir John Carling Bldg., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0C5.													
Canada D.A., Ont.———	C.C.	WL	Syn.	P.D. 58———	1	1	2	3	1	4	4	1	1	1
Carey Farms, 3252 Mt. Olive-Agosta Rd., Marion, Ohio 43302.													
Carey, Ohio———	Fla.	WL	IN	Carey Nick 310———	-	1	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	2
Carey, Ohio———	Pa.	WL	IN	Carey Nick 310———	2	2	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	3
Carey, Ohio———	Tenn.	WL	IN	Carey Nick 310———	1	2	4	3	1	2	2	1	2	1
Colonial Poultry Farm, Inc., Pleasant Hill, Missouri 64080.													
Colonial, Mo.———	N.H.-C.	WL	IN	True-Line 365 B———	3	4	4	2	3	4	4	1	2	3

24

TABLE 5.—Range group ranking for stock entered in 1975-76 random sample egg production tests--(Continued)

ENTRY IDENTIFICATION	TEST	BREEDING	STRAIN OR TRADENAME	INCOME OVER FEED AND CHICK COST ($)	EGG PRODUCTION (Hen housed) (No.)	AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION (Days)	GROWING MORTALITY (%)	LAYING MORTALITY (%)	EGG WEIGHT (oz)	LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (%)	FEED PER POUND OF EGGS (lbs)	ALBUMEN QUALITY (H.U.)	BLOOD SPOTS (%)
Colonial Poultry Farm, Inc., Pleasant Hill, Missouri 64080.													
Colonial, Mo.—	C.C.	WL	IN	True-Line 365 S---	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2
Colonial, Mo.—	Fla.	WL	IN	True-Line 365 S---	-	3	2	4	2	4	3	1	3	2
Colonial, Mo.—	Pa.	WL	IN	True-Line 365 S---	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	4	1
Colonial, Mo.—	Tenn.	WL	IN	True-Line 365 S---	1	2	2	1	2	3	3	1	3	1
Davis, Joe K., Hatchery, P.O. Box 27, Earl, North Carolina 28038.													
Davis, N.C.—	N.H.-C.	RIRxBPR	BX	Davis Combiner---	4	4	4	2	3	1	1	4	3	3
Davis, N.C.—	N.H.-F.	RIRxBPR	BX	Davis Combiner---	3	2	4	2	3	2	2	4	4	1
Davis, N.C.—	N.C.	RIRxBPR	BX	Davis Combiner---	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	3	4
DeKalb AgResearch, Inc., Sycamore Rd., DeKalb, Illinois 60115.													
DeKalb, Ill. (Moyer, Pa.)—	N.C.	WL	SX	DeKalb-Kimber K-137	3	4	2	1	4	3	3	3	1	2
DeKalb AgResearch, Inc., Sycamore Rd., DeKalb, Illinois 60115.													
DeKalb, Ill. (Cornwell, N.C.)—	N.C.	--	INX	DeKalb 231---	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	2
DeKalb AgResearch, Inc., Sycamore Rd., DeKalb, Illinois 60115.													
DeKalb, Ill.	Fla.	--	INX	DeKalb X-L Link---	-	2	3	4	4	3	2	2	1	2
DeKalb, Ill.	N.H.-C.	--	INX	DeKalb X-L Link---	2	1	3	1	3	4	4	2	1	3
DeKalb, Ill.	Pa.	--	INX	DeKalb X-L Link---	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3
DeKalb, Ill.	Tenn.	--	INX	DeKalb X-L Link---	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	1	1
DeKalb-Warren, Inc., 229 Main St., North Brookfield, Massachusetts 15350.													
DeKalb-Warren, Ma.—	N.H.-C.	SYNxRIR	BX	Amber Link---	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	1
DeKalb-Warren, Ma.—	N.H.-F.	SYNxRIR	BX	Amber Link---	2	2	2	4	3	4	4	3	1	3
DeKalb-Warren, Ma.—	Pa.	SYNxRIR	BX	Amber Link---	3	2	3	3	1	2	1	1	1	2
DeKalb-Warren, Inc., 229 Main St., North Brookfield, Massachusetts 15350.													
DeKalb-Warren, Ma.—	N.H.-C.	RIRxRIW	BX	Sex Sal Link F---	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	2	2	1
DeKalb-Warren, Ma.—	Pa.	RIRxRIW	BX	Sex Sal Link F---	4	4	3	2	1	1	1	3	2	3
Euribrid, B.V., P.O. Box 30, Boxmeer, Holland													
Euribrid-Pilch, N.C.—	C.C.	WL	SX	Hisex White---	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	3	2
Euribrid-Pilch, N.C.—	Fla.	WL	SX	Hisex White---	-	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	2
Euribrid-Pilch, N.C.—	N.H.-C.	WL	SX	Hisex White---	1	1	4	2	2	4	4	2	2	1
Euribrid-Pilch, N.C. (River View)	N.H.-F.	WL	SX	Hisex White---	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	1	2	1
Euribrid-Pilch, N.C. New Brunswick, Can.)—	N.C.	WL	SX	Hisex White---	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	3	2
Euribrid-Pilch, N.C.—	Pa.	WL	SX	Hisex White---	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	4	3
Euribrid-Pilch, N.C.—	Tenn.	WL	SX	Hisex White---	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	2

TABLE 5.—Range group ranking for stock entered in 1975-76 random sample egg production tests—(Continued)

ENTRY IDENTIFICATION	TEST	BREEDING	STRAIN OR TRADENAME	INCOME OVER FEED AND CHICK COST ($)	EGG PRODUCTION (Hen housed) (No.)	AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION (Days)	GROWING MORTALITY (%)	LAYING MORTALITY (%)	EGG WEIGHT (oz)	LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (%)	FEED PER POUND OF EGGS (lbs)	ALBUMEN QUALITY (H.U.)	BLOOD SPOTS (%)
Fisher Poultry Farm, Ltd., Ayton, Ontario, Canada NOG 1C0													
Fisher, Ont.—	C.C.	WL	Fisher 107—	2	2	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Fisher, Ont.—	N.H.-C.	WL	Fisher 107—	3	3	1	2	4	2	2	2	1	1
Fisher, Ont.—	Pa.	WL	Fisher 107—	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2
Fisher Poultry Farm, Ltd., Ayton, Ontario, Canada NOG 1C0													
Fisher, Ont.—	C.C.	Syn.	Fisher 505—	4	4	2	4	4	3	3	4	4	4
Garber Poultry Breeding Farm, 4255 Hammett Rd., Modesto, California 95351.													
Garber, Calif.—	Pa.	WL	Garber G 200—	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	1	1
Hardy, C. Nelson & Son, Essex, Massachusetts 01929.													
Hardy, Mass.—	N.H.-C.	RIRxBPR	Deluxe Sex Link—	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	4	4	3
Hubbard Farms, Inc., Walpole, New Hampshire 03608.													
Hubbard, N.H.—	N.H.-C.	SYNxN.H.BX	Golden Comet—	2	3	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	1
Hubbard, N.H.—	N.C.	SYNxN.H.BX	Golden Comet—	3	4	2	3	4	1	2	2	3	4
Hubbard, N.H.—	Pa.	SYNxN.H.BX	Golden Comet—	3	3	1	1	4	2	1	3	3	3
Hubbard Farms, Inc., Walpole, New Hampshire 03608.													
Hubbard, N.H.—	C.C.	WL	Hubbard Leghorn—	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	3	3
Hubbard, N.H.—	Fla.	WL	Hubbard Leghorn—	-	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4
Hubbard, N.H.—	N.H.-C.	WL	Hubbard Leghorn—	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	1	3	3
Hubbard, N.H.—	Pa.	WL	Hubbard Leghorn—	1	1	1	4	3	2	2	1	3	3
Ideal Poultry Breeding Farms, P.O. Box 591, Cameron, Texas 76520.													
Ideal, Texas—	Fla.	SYNxWL	Ideal 236—	-	3	4	4	3	2	2	3	4	3
Ideal, Texas—	N.H.-C.	SYNxWL	Ideal 236—	4	4	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	1
Ideal, Texas—	Pa.	SYNxWL	Ideal 236—	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	4	1
Ideal, Texas—	Tenn.	SYNxWL	Ideal 236—	3	3	2	3	4	2	2	2	4	2
Indiana Farm Bureau Coop., 2435 Kentucky Ave., Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.													
Indiana Farm Bureau, Ind.—	Pa.	WL	Duchess 60—	2	2	1	3	4	4	4	1	1	1
Nelson, George F., Route 2, Truro, Nova Scotia, Canada													
Nelson, Nova Scotia—	N.H.-F.	WL	Nelson 264—	4	4	2	3	3	1	1	4	4	3
North Central Regional Poultry Breeding Lab., Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana 47907.													
N.C. Reg. Plty., Ind.—	Tenn.	WL	Reg. Cornell Contr.	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
Parks Poultry Farm, Route 4, Box 118, Altoona, Pennsylvania 16601.													
Parks, Pa.—	Fla.	WL	Keystone B-1—	-	3	1	4	3	2	3	3	4	2
Parks, Pa.—	N.H.-C.	WL	Keystone B-1—	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	2	1
Parks, Pa.—	Pa.	WL	Keystone B-1—	2	1	1	3	3	2	2	2	4	2

26

TABLE 5.—Range group ranking for stock entered in 1975-76 random sample egg production tests—(Continued)

ENTRY IDENTIFICATION	TEST	BREEDING	STRAIN OR TRADENAME	INCOME OVER FEED AND CHICK COST ($)	EGG PRODUCTION (Hen housed) (No.)	AGE AT 50% PRODUCTION (Days)	GROWING MORTALITY (%)	LAYING MORTALITY (%)	EGG WEIGHT (oz)	LARGE AND EXTRA LARGE EGGS (%)	FEED PER POUND OF EGGS (lbs)	ALBUMEN QUALITY (H.U.)	BLOOD SPOTS (%)
Parks Poultry Farm, Route 4, Box 118, Altoona, Pennsylvania 16601.													
Parks, Pa.——	N.H.-F.	RIRxWPR BX	Sil-Go-Links——	4	4	3	2	4	2	2	4	3	4
Parks, Pa.——	Pa.	RIRxWPR BX	Sil-Go-Links——	4	4	3	2	1	2	2	4	2	3
Shaver Poultry Breeding Farms, Ltd., Box 400, Cambridge, Ontario, Canada N1R 5V9.													
Shaver, Ont.——	C.C.	WL	SX	Starcross 288——	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Shaver, Ont.——	Fla.	WL	SX	Starcross 288——	-	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
Shaver, Ont.——	N.H.-C.	WL	SX	Starcross 288——	1	1	3	3	2	2	2	1	2	1
Shaver, Ont.——	N.H.-F.	WL	SX	Starcross 288——	1	1	1	4	2	3	2	1	1	2
Shaver, Ont. (Delta, Fla.)——	N.C.	WL	SX	Starcross 288——	1	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	3	2
Shaver, Ont.——	Pa.	WL	SX	Starcross 288——	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2
Shaver, Ont.——	Tenn.	WL	SX	Starcross 288——	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2
Shaver Poultry Breeding Farms, Ltd., Box 400, Cambridge, Ontario, Canada N1R 5V9.													
Shaver, Ont.——	N.H.-C.	RIR	SX	Starcross 579——	2	2	2	4	1	1	1	3	4	1
Tatum Farms, Route 3, Dawsonville, Georgia 30534.													
Tatum, Ga.——	Tenn.	WL	SX	Tatum T-100——	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	3
Tatum Farms, Route 3, Dawsonville, Georgia 30534.													
Tatum, Ga.——	Tenn.	RIRxSYN BX	Tatum T-173——	3	3	4	3	1	3	2	3	1	4
Welp's Poultry Breeding Farm, Box 366, Bancroft, Iowa 50517.													
Welp, Iowa——	N.H.-C.	RIR	SX	Welp Line 650 N——	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Welp's Poultry Breeding Farm, Box 366, Bancroft, Iowa 50517.													
Welp, Iowa——	Fla.	WL	SX	Welp Line 975——	-	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	3
Welp, Iowa——	N.H.-C.	WL	SX	Welp Line 975——	4	4	1	3	3	4	4	3	2	3
Welp, Iowa——	Tenn.	WL	SX	Welp Line 975——	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3

RANDOM SAMPLE EGG PRODUCTION TEST ENTRIES AND CONDITIONS, 1975-76

TABLE 6.--Stock entered in 1975-76 tests

Breeder	Stock Code	Strain or trade name	Number of entries	Tests entered						
				C.C.	Fla.	N.H.-C.	N.H.-F.	N.C.	Pa.	Tenn.
Animal Res. Inst.------	570	Kentville, R.B.C.------	1	X						
Anthony----------------	457	Anthony Leghorn 76----	2						X	X
Babcock----------------	307	Babcock B-300---------	6	X	X	X		X	X	X
Babcock----------------	442	Babcock B-380---------	5			X	X	X	X	X
Barr-------------------	459	Barr's Barred Rock----	1							X
Canada Dept. of Agri.-	982	P.D. 58---------------	1	X						
Carey------------------	437	Carey Nick 310--------	3		X				X	X
Colonial---------------	289	True-Line 365 B-------	1			X				
Colonial---------------	432	True-Line 365 S-------	4	X	X				X	X
Davis------------------	309	Davis Combiner--------	3			X	X	X		
DeKalb-----------------	454	DeKalb 231------------	1					X		
DeKalb-----------------	458	DeKalb X-L Link-------	4		X	X			X	X
DeKalb-Kimber----------	110	DeKalb-Kimber K 137--	1					X		
DeKalb-Warren----------	456	Amber Link------------	3			X	X		X	
DeKalb-Warren----------	305	Sex-Sal-Link F-------	2			X			X	
Euribrid---------------	447	Hisex White----------	7	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fisher-----------------	607	Fisher 107-----------	3	X		X			X	
Fisher-----------------	608	Fisher 505-----------	1	X						
Garber-----------------	66	Garber G 200---------	1						X	
Hardy------------------	86	Deluxe Sex Link------	1			X				

TABLE 6.--Stock entered in 1975-76 tests--Continued

Breeder	Code	Strain or trade name	Number of entries	C.C.	Fla.	N.H.-C.	N.H.-F.	N.C.	Pa.	Tenn.
Hubbard--------------	378	Golden Comet--------	3			X		X	X	
Hubbard--------------	461	Hubbard Leghorn-----	4	X	X	X			X	
Ideal----------------	356	Ideal 236-----------	4		X	X			X	X
Indiana Farm Bureau--	234	Duchess 60----------	1						X	
Nelson---------------	609	Nelson 264----------	1				X			
N. Cent. Reg. Lab.---	37	Reg. Cornell Control-	1							X
Parks----------------	352	Parks Keystone B-1---	3		X	X			X	
Parks----------------	382	Parks Sil-Go-Link----	2				X		X	
Shaver---------------	181	Shaver Starcross 288-	7	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Shaver---------------	451	Shaver 579----------	1			X				
Tatum----------------	401	Tatum T-100---------	1						X	
Tatum----------------	449	Tatum T-173---------	1						X	X
Welp-----------------	440	Welp Line 650 N-----	1		X	X				
Welp-----------------	460	Welp Line 975-------	3		X	X				X

Test	Hatched	Age at housing (days)	Length of test (days)	Entries (number)	Replications Number	Replications Birds per rep.	Housing management Brooding	Housing management Rearing	Housing management Laying[1]	Sq. feed per bird
Central Canada------	4/29/75	147	496	12	8	66	Cage	Cage	Cage-2	0.45
Florida-------------	5/26/75	150	486	12	8	24	Litter	Litter	Cage-2	.6
					4	50	Litter	Litter	Litter	2.9
New Hampshire Cage--	5/8/75	147	500	23	8	24	Litter	Cage	Cage-3	.5
New Hampshire Floor-	5/8/75	147	500	8	3	30	Litter	Litter	Litter	3.2
North Carolina------	3/28/75	150	498	10	2	50	Litter	Litter	Litter-slat	1.7
					2	50	Colony cage	Colony cage	Colony cage-7	.5
					2	52	Colony cage	Colony cage	Cage-2	.6
Pennsylvania--------	4/25/75	150	499	24	2	48	Litter	Litter	Cage-3	.5
					2	50	Litter	Litter	Litter	1.7
Tennessee----------	4/2/75	140	500	14	8	30	Litter	Litter	Cage-2	.45

1/ The numerals after the word "cage" refer to the number of birds per cage.

TABLE 7.--Management, rations, laying house environment,
and vaccination provided by tests, 1975-76--Continued

Test	Entries brooded inter-mingled	Minimum oz./doz. for large eggs	Protein (percent)			Metabolizable energy[2] (calories/pound)			Metabolizable calories Crude Protein[3]		
			Start	Grow	Lay	Start	Grow	Lay	Start	Grow	Lay
Central Canada------	No	24	17.7	14.4	16.5	1270	1290	1300	58.0	79.1	76.9
Florida-------------	No	23	22.0	15.3	16.9	1270	988	1273	57.7	64.6	75.1
New Hampshire-------	Yes	23.5	20.9	16.0	17.0 15.0	1340	1319	1255 1337	64.0	82.0	72.0 81.0
North Carolina------	No	23	20.0	16.0	15 to 20	1249	1238	1303	62.4	77.4	71.2
Pennsylvania--------	Yes	24	21.0	17.0	18.0	1300[4]	1357[4]	1354[4]	61.9	79.8	75.2
Tennessee-----------	No	23	22.0 22.0	17.6 16.2	16.7[5] 16.7[5]	1365 1365	1382 1443	1305 1305	62.0 62.0	78.5 89.0	78.1 78.1

[2] Metabolizable energy is the maximum quantity of feed energy that possibly may be used by the chicken.

[3] Metabolizable calories divided by percent crude protein.

[4] Approximate metabolizable energy computed from productive energy, using 70 percent as the conversion factor.

[5] See Tennessee Test Report for complete ration combinations.

31

TABLE 7.--Management, rations, laying house environment,
and vaccination provided by tests, 1975-76--Continued

Test	Lighting		Artificial heat used	R Value of insulation material[6]		Ventilation
	Rearing (hours)	Laying (hours)				
Central Canada------	([7])	([8])	Yes	Ceiling Walls Walls	27.9 15.1	Exhaust fans in roof and in east wall.
Florida-------------	Natural	15	No	Cage Summer House Winter	13.0 8.0	Natural ridge vents.
New Hampshire-------	14	14	No	Ceiling Walls	15.0 15.0	Exhaust Fans.
North Carolina------	Step down	Step up to 17	No	Ceiling Walls	7.3	Natural via windows.
Pennsylvania--------	8	12 to 17	Yes	Ceiling Walls	15.5 15.5	Exhaust.
Tennessee-----------	Natural	14	No	Ceiling Walls	13.0 None	Winter, Positive pressure; Summer, Exhaust fans.

[6] Due to variations in type of construction, R Values will be approximate for some tests.

[7] At day old--18-1/2 hr.; light decreased 15 minutes per week to meet at 15-1/2 hr. at longest day, then natural decrease until 13-1/2 hr.

[8] 13-1/2 hr. until natural increase takes light hours to 15-1/2 hr. in mid-June, then light held at 15-1/2 hr. until end of test.

Test	Newcastle		Infectious bronchitis		Fowl Pox		Encephalo-myelitis		Coccidiosis control		Marek's Disease
	Type	Age (wk.)	Type	Age (wk.)	Type	Age (wk.)	Type	Age (wk.)	Type	Age (wk.)	Age
Central Canada--	Spray Spray	1.5 19	Spray Spray	1.5 12	Wing web.	8	Water Water	8 15			1 day
Florida---------	Water Water	1,3,10 16	Water Water	1,3 10,16	Wing web.	8	None	--	Poly-stat	0-15	1 day
New Hampshire---	Dust Dust	2 20	Dust Dust	2 20	None	--	None	--	Cocci-Vac	1	1 day
North Carolina--	Ocular Water Water +Every 90 days	1 day 4 17	Ocular Water Water	1 day 4 17	Wing web.	9	Water	12	Cage-None Floor- 6 species Cocci	-- 1	1 day Keenum
Pennsylvania----	Water Water Water	4 8 16	Water Water Water	4 8 16	Wing web.	8	None	--	Amprol	0-20	1 day
Tennessee-------	Water Water Water	1 6 20	Water Water Water	1 6 20	Wing web.	6	None	--	Amprol	0-20	1 day